

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated January 15, 2008. Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 11, 14 to 32, 35 to 39 and 42 to 65 are pending in the application, and claims 66 to 7 have been added herein. Claims 1, 29, 55 and 57 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

#### Interview Summary

Initially, the Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Leroux for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded during the personal interview conducted on March 6, 2008. In the interview, several proposed claim amendments were discussed, including the newly clarified feature of claim 1 that, in the client application, a request signal is automatically generated in response to the interest signal and sent to a second server to request a text extract, the text extract including text data previously extracted from the second web document and stored separately from the second web document. Although no agreement regarding allowability was reached, all parties agreed that the interview aided the mutual understanding of the disclosure and generally advanced prosecution.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14 to 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42 to 52, 54, 55, 57 and 59 to 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0057297 ("Grimes") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0054116 ("Pavley") and Official Notice; claims 9 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Grimes and Pavley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,273 ("Banerjee"); claims 27 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Grimes and Pavley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,443 ("Bruneau"); and claims 2, 30, 56 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Grimes and Pavley in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0044224 ("Jun"). In response, claims 1, 29, 55 and 57 are being amended to further

clarify several additional features. Support for the amendments is found throughout the disclosure, including at least pages 8, 9, 12, 13, 20 and 21 of the specification and FIG. 1. Withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

First and foremost, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's use of official notice, for instance at page 5 of the Office Action, to assert that "comparing a previously available version of the second document with a current version of the second document is well-known and expected in the art." Under MPEP § 2144.03(A), official notice may only be taken by the Examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art, are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. *See* MPEP § 2144.03(A). More to the point, an Examiner is prohibited from taking official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. *See id.*

In the instant case, the Applicants respectfully assert that the above-mentioned feature is not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration. For example, although the Office Action has itself cited twelve references in the Forms PTO-892 and PTO-1449A which accompany the Office Action, it is notable that *none* of these references are asserted by the Examiner to describe this feature, a feature which is alleged to be instantly and unquestionably demonstrated or "well known" by the art. The Applicants respectfully assert that these features are ineligible for office notice and further request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence if the rejection is to be maintained. *See* MPEP § 2144.03(C).

Referring to particular claim language, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the features of (i) displaying, to a user, a first web document received from a first server, the first web document further including a search engine result set; and (ii) automatically generating in the client application a request signal in response to the interest signal and sending the request signal to a second server to request a text extract, the text extract comprising text data previously extracted from the second web document and stored separately from the second web document. Although not identical, independent claims 29, 55, and 57 recite similar features in other contexts. The Applicants submit that the applied references do not disclose, teach or to suggest at least the foregoing features.

Grimes describes a personalized content manager which displays lists of program titles 76 on a dynamic GUI 110. *See* Grimes, ¶ [0050]; FIG. 5; and Abstract. When a program title 76 displayed on the dynamic GUI 110 is double-clicked with a cursor, the dynamic GUI 110 displays information about the selected program, for example a program description or hotlink included in a program nugget 74 provided by the content provider (or “signal origination point 12”) itself. *See* Grimes, ¶¶ [0035] to [0039] and [0050]; and FIG. 1.

In this regard, Applicants submit that nothing in Grimes describes that the “program title” represents a web document comprising a search engine result set, that the displayed information about the selected program is requested “in response” to a user action indicating that the user has an interest in a hyperlink, or that the displayed information about a selected program is stored anywhere else than with the content itself, at the signal original point 12 or the client 18. That being the case, Grimes also cannot describe the features of (i) displaying, to a user, a first web document received from a first server, the first web document further including a search engine result set; and (ii) automatically generating in the client application a request signal in response to the interest signal and sending the request signal to a second server to request a text extract, the text extract comprising text data previously extracted from the second web document and stored separately from the second web document.

Pavley, which appears to have been cited merely for its use of the term “text clip” in its abstract, describes a method and apparatus for editing heterogeneous media objects. *See* Pavley, Abstract. As Pavley also does not recite at least the foregoing distinguishing features, it does not remedy the apparent deficiencies of Grimes. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been shown.

The other rejected claims in the application are each dependent on these independent claims and are thus believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each claim is deemed to define additional aspects of the disclosure, however, the individual consideration of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested. For instance, new claim 66, which allows for the receipt of a selection signal and an interest signal associated with a hyperlink of a first web document in response to a user action, is submitted to be clearly distinguishable from Grimes, which only allows for a single type of interaction (a double-click selection) of the hyperlink. *See, e.g.*, Grimes, ¶ [0050].

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the references, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Since the amendments made herein have been made solely in an effort to expedite advancement of this case, the Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

To the extent that they are due, fees for the excess claims are being paid by way of the Electronic Filing System (EFS). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2008

/David E. A. Jordan/

David E. A. Jordan  
Reg. No. 50,325

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331